

**AMADOR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
October 6, 2022 – 9:49 a.m.**

The Amador County Transportation Commission (ACTC) met on the above date, and the following proceedings were had, to wit:

**Present on Roll Call:**

Dominic Atlan, Chairman  
Steve McLean, Vice Chairman  
Susan Bragstad  
Patrick Crew (alternate for Richard Forster)  
Brian Oneto

**Absent:**

John Plasse

**Also Present:**

John Gedney, Executive Director, ACTC  
Felicia Bridges, Administrative Secretary, ACTC  
Maggie Amarant, General Manager, Amador Transit  
Gregoria Ponce, Office Chief of Rural Planning, Caltrans District 10

**AGENDA:**

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Oneto, seconded by Commissioner Crew and carried to approve the agenda.

Ayes: Atlan, McLean, Bragstad, Crew, Oneto  
Noes: None  
Absent: Plasse

**PUBLIC MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:** Steve Christensen, Sutter Creek resident, stated he was recently at a meeting with Sheriff Redman regarding various issues. Sheriff Redman mentioned to him that the Lone Fire Department had opened their building as a cooling center during the last heat wave. Mr. Christensen visited the Department to extend his gratitude to Chief Mackey and was shown a booklet that had been put together for emergency preparedness, including the evacuation routes of Amador County. He thought this should be in the household of every resident in Amador County, and expressed his appreciation for what Chief Mackey and his department has prepared. Mr. Christensen also noted that Lone has installed a 'panic button' that, if set off, notifies residents there is a problem in the area and suggested that all fire departments should have installed.

Commissioner Oneto credited those evacuation maps to Ms. Cindy Engel, ACTC GIS Coordinator.

**CONSENT AGENDA (Items #1-5):** Mr. Gedney, based on the previous conversation in the Amador Transit meeting, highlighted item #5-FY 2023/24 Transportation Development Act Unmet Transit

Needs Allocation Process regarding the process to distribute Local Transportation Funds. He added that the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council members has provided comments requesting clarification of the strict criteria that ACTC has adopted versus the recent waiver provided by AB-90/AB-149.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Oneto, seconded by Commissioner McLean, and carried to approve Consent Agenda.

Ayes: Atlan, McLean, Bragstad, Crew, Oneto  
Noes: None  
Absent: Plasse

**REGULAR AGENDA:**

**#6. ACTC Conference Room Equipment Upgrade:** Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

Commissioners discussed various ideas to make the system more effective.

Commissioners suggested moving forward with the bid but to inquire with Mission IT Services regarding the wiring and relocation of the large television.

Gary Reinoehl, Amador County resident, encouraged the commissioners to move quickly on the improvements.

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Crew, seconded by McLean, and carried to approve the moving forward with the bid from Mission IT with flexibility to renegotiate tasks with regard to exterior wiring and relocation of the large television to accommodate cost savings.

Ayes: Atlan, McLean, Bragstad, Crew, Oneto  
Noes: None  
Absent: Plasse

**#7. Amador County Unified School District Consolidation Plan Traffic Impacts:** Mr. Gedney introduced Dr. Critchfield - Deputy Superintendent of Business Services, Dr. Torie Gibson - ACUSD Superintendent and Nadine Zanzie, Project Manager. He then reviewed his staff report. He relayed the commission's interest in details of the plan and noted that it does appear this is a project that falls under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). He highlighted the board would like to see a traffic study performed with mitigation measures implemented prior to opening day. Mr. Gedney also highlighted additional questions including: Lead Agency status and approving authority for the consolidation project if the bond measure passes, how notices would be distributed to commenting agencies like ACTC, and how ACTC could be involved in the mitigation recommendation to improve access. He reviewed projects within the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) such as the Sutter Street Extension and the Wicklow Way Extension that could assist in mitigation of this consolidation project; however, noting that improvements on the State Highway could not be implemented by the current proposed schedule for opening day.

---

Dr. Critchfield provided a handout to the board and public members present (*Information about Measure H-Amador County Unified School District*). Dr. Gibson noted on the handout there is a QR code providing more in-depth plans for construction of each school site. Dr. Critchfield stated ACUSD will be going through the CEQA process and performing a traffic study. He noted the timeline for the consolidation at this point is August 2025. There was discussion of August 2024 but that was in the event there were no issues through the process, which is very unlikely. He then reviewed the handout which included site maps of Jackson Elementary School, Lone Junior High School, and Amador Consolidated High School. In regard to the Amador High School site, it was not included due to the enrollment size only including 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students which Dr. Critchfield asserted would actually improve traffic/parking due to no student drivers. He noted with regard to Lone Elementary's traffic impacts, since this school will be closed and those students will be directed to Lone Junior High School, that a traffic concern on SR 104 will be eliminated. Dr. Critchfield reviewed the Amador Consolidated High School site (current Argonaut High School location) extended parent drop-off zone which would be installed with automatic gates at all entry/exit points on both Argonaut Lane and Stoney Creek Road to help control the flow of traffic. He stated the estimated number of enrolled students at the new consolidated high school would be approximately 1,200.

Mr. Gedney noted the main concern is the intersection of SR88/Argonaut Lane. He continued the internal circulation looks good but there was discussion of potential mitigation of improvements off-sight and Dr. Critchfield had mentioned that the bond is flexible enough to offer some funding for off-sight mitigation. However, they would prefer not using those funds for that, and rather use developer fees for those mitigation efforts. Mr. Gedney stated that the idea of having an opening day of August 2025, knowing that the traffic study will show improvements needed either at Wicklow Way Extension or improvements at the intersection of Argonaut Lane, leaves an unrealistic timeline to make those improvements before the proposed opening date.

Dr. Critchfield reiterated they will go through the CEQA process, but there are other strategies that can be utilized regarding how to orchestrate drop-off/pick-up times and how drivers leave the campuses. He stated there are internal mechanisms to help reduce traffic such as automated gates for flow, traffic guards, and staggering release times. He pointed out that when an athletic event occurs currently on that campus there is a high level of traffic – lessons can be learned from those patterns.

Chairman Atlan stated what has been discussed today is the internal mitigation that ACUSD will perform for this consolidation. However, this agency's interest is the highways and roadways to get to the schools. When reading the bond, there is no dedicated traffic funding, rather the ACUSD is putting the burden on other agencies. He continued when the traffic doubles on Argonaut Lane this agency will be called in to fix the intersection - we would require funding from ACUSD to help with that, but there is no funding in the bond shown for that purpose. Chairman Atlan commented that the ACUSD has reached out to other schools but has not reached out to Caltrans, ACTC, or the cities. He asked how the developer fees would cover these extreme traffic impacts and asked when will the traffic study be performed.

Ms. Zanzie responded that as the school district goes through the design and development process working with the school sites for concepts, that they also work with engineers for the topography of the site. She stated that the work is wrapping up, and through the CEQA process, one needs to have

---

the scope of work clearly defined in order to analyze the impact. Once that work is complete, the district, in coordination with the CEQA consultant, will follow the process which will include reaching out to agencies and the community moving forward. She added that the traffic study will tell them exactly what the impact is so they can make the assessment. She noted at this point it is too premature to speculate and approach agencies to implement improvements for resolution of identified impacts when it has not yet been defined what the total impacts will be at those intersections.

Chairman Atlan asked knowing there will be impacts why is there no funding in the bond for those impacts. She stated as we are not that far in the process and not understanding yet the impact or the cost, we are not at that point yet. Chairman Atlan stated then no improvements will be made prior to opening day. He noted ACTC will require that these improvements are in place prior to consolidation because, if not, all of those impacts will then be put on this body. Ms. Zanzie commented we would work cooperatively with ACTC to mitigate these traffic impacts, and ACUSD would need a copy of the RTP list of projects to synchronize those projects to move forward.

Mr. Gedney asked if the bond does not pass, will the ACUSD move forward with the consolidation plan. Dr. Gibson stated yes. Mr. Gedney noted that this is a Project (under CEQA) then, and a traffic analysis going forward with the consolidation plan should be performed now. She stated the District will have to comply with CEQA, it is required by state law, any project on a school site of that magnitude for additions or consolidation and the district has complied in the past and intends to comply here. Mr. Gedney asked why hasn't the school complied with CEQA now, if the plan is already in place. Dr. Critchfield replied the board took action in May to consolidate, and noted he has been meeting with contracted architects weekly to get all the plans where they need to be for the CEQA process.

Mona Ebrahimi, ACTC Legal Counsel, stated to summarize a main concern of the ACTC board, is that this project seems very similar to the facts of a 2008 CEQA case called Safe TARA vs. City of West Hollywood where in that case the city had a conditional agreement where they were moving forward with a project but said they were not carrying it out until CEQA was conducted. She continued that a funding plan was and a project idea was place, but that decision was challenged on the grounds that it could not be implemented without performing CEQA first because at some point the city is committed to a particular course of action that cannot be undone. She stated the concern is that ACUSD is carrying out decisions in advance of CEQA that are going to end up backwards. Ms. Ebrahimi complimented the ACUSD on providing a great description of what the plans are, but emphasized that CEQA should have happened prior to the board's decision, and CEQA should not wait any longer. Second, because the bond language is so broad, there is no earmarking and no guarantee that some of those funds will be used to offset some of those environmental impacts caused by the project. In fact, it's an advisory measure to see if the constituents support the repair, support, replacement, consolidation, construction of these facilities, but it does not itself say that. With bond measures we cannot expend bond money on things that are not specifically earmarked, that would leave the only other money you have for those mitigation purposes presumably from development impact fees that are derived from Senate Bill 50, unless the District is getting development impact fees from a development agreement through a city under a third-party beneficiary - so, potential mitigation funds are extremely limited. Ms. Ebrahimi reiterated that ACTC is concerned that CEQA should have been done/has not been done, nor sufficient funds set aside to offset mitigation measures, and feels that the District needs to ensure that mitigation is implemented prior to the impacts occurring so that transportation facilities can safely

absorb the impacts. She noted other issues such as emergency situations where a bottleneck occurs. She stated that a letter will be provided that encapsulates all these issues but would like to work collaboratively so these are addressed, and ACTC is not subsidizing any of the traffic impacts or having public complaints brought to the ACTC board about these traffic concerns. Ms. Ebrahimi asked to have ACTC be put on any notifications for public hearings, notice of preparation for initial studies, and to work toward implementation of these improvements prior to construction.

Dr. Critchfield stated it appears there is an assumption that the bond money is the only money the ACUSD has. He continued through consolidation the district will be saving millions of dollars in operational costs and are in a strong financial position as a district already. The District can operate with the number of schools we have. He added developer fees continue to come in and there is a balance of nearly \$4 million presently, not to mention reserves totaling \$4 million plus county office reserves. Dr. Critchfield stated again when you go through CEQA, part of that is who is paying for what and how it all looks. He cautioned that just because we did not write language in the bond to specifically identify funds for traffic mitigation, that does not mean there is not funding sources to deal with what the traffic study will show.

Chairman Atlan stated developer fees are charged through a Nexus Study and what the ACUSD is saying is that they will use developer fees that were collected under one set of circumstances that have now changed and use them for that, and noted he does not believe that is legal.

Dr. Gibson stated that their job is taking care of schools, not ACTC's. She continued they are in charge of schools, to do what is best for schools, and they live and breathe it. She noted as previously mentioned the ACUSD will follow the CEQA process and what they are responsible for legally, they will make sure they do that. Dr. Gibson emphasized the consolidation will happen because financially and educationally that is what is best for the kids. She continued that the District will pay for what is required to pay to make it better for the community, but noted there are parts of this that have been the responsibility of the cities and County for long time. She stated those transportation projects have been on that ACTC list for many years, so the impact of that intersection is extremely unsafe already and has nothing to do with the schools.

Vice Chairman McLean commented it does seem to be "the cart before the horse" strategy, and asked at what point do the residents of Amador County get to vote on the consolidation by itself. Dr. Critchfield stated they do not, it is a board action not a community vote.

Patti Fisher-Misuraca, resident of City of Lone, stated she has been asked by the city to perform research on this item and the effects it will have on the city. She stated it will be different running an elementary school out of residential roads rather than a main highway. She asked who bears the cost of the various roadways that will now be impacted by this consolidation city, county, ACTC. Mr. Gedney replied that brings up a great point of who is the implementing agency, the lead agency on this, and who is the approving agency. He stated typically ACTC deals with city jurisdictions that approve a development proposal (new housing, employment, etc.) and along with it a traffic study is prepared. Then, the developer in coordination with the city or County, would require appropriate mitigation. In this case it is more confusing since the school board took action to approve this consolidation plan but there is no governing agency like a city or County who would be responsible for requiring a traffic study and setting

---

Conditions of Approval for the Project. Dr. Critchfield commented that what is unique about the ACUSD construction process, is that the District goes through state approval, the Department of State Architect (DSA) reviews the plans and holds a great deal of the weight in what is constructed. He added that, typically, the local fire agency gets to weigh in also and sign off as long as the plans meet all fire codes. He stated other local agencies do not hold much weight of what goes on in their projects, unless through CEQA and traffic study identify what needs to be done to mitigate impacts. He stated a few years ago they put in a building at Argonaut High School and there is an easement with a sewer line that ran through the campus. He noted the way the plans were drawn up, they were a bit off where the sewer line actually was, and this was an instance where ACUSD did work with the City of Jackson and were able to modify the plans with the State and make it work.

Mr. Gedney asked Ms. Ebrahimi to provide input regarding the DSA oversight. Ms. Ebrahimi stated there are two (2) separate and distinct issues. The design and operation of the schools, as an arm of the state unlike most other local agencies, the District must comply with many State regulations. Other local agencies including the city and commission cannot interfere with their operation decisions, consolidation decisions, building or even zoning codes. However, the school district, assuming they are going to be the lead agency for purposes of CEQA, have to identify and inform 'responsible agencies' of their decision to move forward with this. A responsible agency is an agency that has affected resources that this district is going to impact. Resources can be streets and highways, wetland, etc. These agencies get noticed of the project proposal and can provide comments to say whether or not the project as described and as conditioned for mitigation improvements adequately resolves the impacts from the project to the environment. What no one is allowed to do is ask for or require mitigation of existing conditions, only the impacts that the new project would create. However, to the extent there are going to impacts to the streets and highways we can ask and require those be mitigated and that can be in the form of construction and improvements, traffic calming measures, and we can provide what we believe would be appropriate measures. She stated it will all stem from what the traffic study tells us.

Ms. Ebrahim asked if there is a timeline for the traffic study. Ms. Zanzie replied no they are accelerating with the design and once the board approves that, then the architect can move forward with a defined scope of work. Dr. Critchfield added the designs will be done no later than December because the State architect will be imposing a series of requirements on buildings starting January 1<sup>st</sup>. He noted to avoid that they are on track to have those plans done and submitted to the State in early December.

Yvonne Kimball, City Manager-Jackson, stated she is glad the sewer issue was resolved but noted had that not been resolved there would not be capacity for consolidation. She commented the city would like to be closely communicated with regarding this plan and does not feel open communication was provided early on. She emphasized the city is there to help and they want the plan to be successful.

Gary Reinoehl, Amador County resident, stated he appreciates what the school is trying to do to help the schools in the long run, but highlighted the SR 88/Pine Grove Improvement Project as an example of a project that will provide traffic improvements at the elementary school. He noted the school district did not contribute any funds to that project due to lack of funding but now claim to have various funding sources to accommodate this current project.

Chairman Atlan stated he is glad to hear that the CEQA process will be followed and commissioners directed legal counsel to write a letter to the ACUSD requesting to be formally put on notification lists for any public hearings/CEQA notices, and to ask some of the questions raised today as well as additional questions legal counsel may have.

Commissioners took a break at 10:56 a.m. Commissioners resumed the meeting at 11:14 a.m.

**#8. Clean California Beautification Program- Plymouth Gateway and Trails Project Briefing with Sam Sherman:** Mr. Gedney introduced Mr. Sam Sherman, Caltrans Clean California Coordinator to discuss the beautification project in Plymouth.

Mr. Sherman extended his appreciation for the opportunity to share information about the project. He stated he previously worked as a project manager on the Sutter Creek bypass project and looks forward to working in Amador County again. He reviewed the Clean California State Beautification program. Mr. Sherman noted in the first proposal, the main focus was on landscape improvements of the roundabout and gateway monuments followed by a trail system for safety. However, through subsequent calls from the public the trail system became the higher priority. The trail system does make sense to accommodate quite a few different needs for safety and beautification. Mr. Sherman then reviewed his handout (conceptual layout) for the trail system path. He stated the path will be approximately 10 feet wide and probably paved but added this is currently in a conceptual design and Caltrans is still waiting on surveys. He noted this project was scheduled to be completed June 2023 when initially proposed, but as it stands now that will not be the case. It seems the construction will more likely begin summer 2023 and be completed in November 2023. Mr. Sherman stated one tricky area is the crossing. Caltrans does not like to install crossings on high-speed roads, as such, they are in conversations with the traffic safety department. He continued it may be likely they do not delineate the crosswalk on the road itself, but some mitigation such as rapid flashing signs or traffic calming measures. He stated possibly on a follow-up project, additional enhancements may be installed.

Mr. Sherman also highlighted other local grant programs through the Clean California Program. Of 150 projects, six (6) projects are programmed in District 10. He stated the litter abatement program, which was the largest component, this year has achieved 1 million cubic yards of debris removed for the highways. In District 10 alone, they achieved 43,000 cubic yards. Mr. Sherman emphasized "Dump Days" as a popular program and asked if Amador County is interested they would could provide him a contact to work with to coordinate a date. Commissioner Oneto stated the County does coordinate with the local waste company occasionally to hold similar events and they are very popular and noted an area upcountry may be a great place to hold one. Chairman Atlan commented holding one at the landfill would be a large enough area to accommodate it.

Mr. Sherman highlighted Governor Newsom's Clean California Day of Action which will be statewide for all agencies and communities to focus on cleaning up and respecting the environment.

Mr. Doug Sim, Plymouth City Council, extended his appreciation to Mr. Sherman and noted the residents of Plymouth are excited to have this trail system installed.

Mr. Gedney commented on the initial design that the crossing was located near Empire Street however on the conceptual design provided today the location of the crossing is near the Veteran's Park. He asked, regarding Mr. Sherman's comment about lack of delineation, is there a vision of a HAWK system. Mr. Sherman replied no, hawk systems are very expensive and only having \$1 million in funding available, the goal is to maximize the mitigation measures and keep the trail system the main priority. He noted they may perform a follow-up project to provide additional support that may include a HAWK system in the future. He stated, regarding the location of the crossing, community leaders for the Veterans Park asked to have the crossing at that location so it ties into the trail they will be installing.

Mr. Sim asked if the speed limit through that stretch of road could be lowered to 30 MPH. Mr. Sherman replied there are quite extensive rules for setting speed limits, but it could be considered.

Commissioner Oneto stated when installing traffic calming devices, not to install whatever was installed at the SR 88/Liberty Road roundabout as it was causing tires to blow out. He also asked when installing the trail system, if it could be moved further away from the highway. Mr. Sherman replied they will move it back as far as possible but they have limited right-of-way to work with.

Steve Christensen, Amador County resident, stated he has three (3) questions for Mr. Sherman. One, if there are any other projects through this program planned for Amador County, two, when performing this project will you hire local contractors/workers so the employment stays in the County and three, if litter removal jobs could be offered to homeless individuals that are looking for employment. Mr. Sherman responded currently there are no other projects under this program in Amador County, this Plymouth project will go out to bid through the Caltrans procurement process where local contractors will have an opportunity to submit, and with regard to litter abatement, there are programs that offer opportunities for homeless and formerly incarcerated individuals to participate and better themselves. Mr. Christensen asked how those individuals would apply. Mr. Sherman replied individuals should contact the Butte County Office of Education, as they are the prime contractor for Caltrans for hiring these crews.

Commissioner McLean noted there is the Adopt-a-Highway program where local agencies can participate. Mr. Sherman agreed and noted there is a stipend available in the amount of \$250.00 for agencies that clean up their section of highway.

**#9. City of Jackson Hybrid Vehicle Reimbursement:** Mr. Gedney reviewed his staff report.

**Motion:** It was moved by Vice Chairman McLean, seconded by Commissioner Crew, and carried to approve reimbursement to the City of Jackson in the amount of \$33,641 toward the purchase of a Ford Explorer Hybrid Vehicle.

Ayes: Atlan, McLean, Crew, Oneto  
Noes: None  
Absent: Bragstad, Plasse

**#10. CalRecycle Debris Removal from Caldor Fire- Impacts to Shenandoah Road:** Commissioner Oneto stated the County received an email from Caltrans stating they would like to use some of the County's



routes to address the Caldor Fire debris clean-up. He stated all that was asked was to repair the roadways that may be damaged in the process. He continued that approximately one month later multiple trucks were seen utilizing Shenandoah Road. Commissioner Oneto stated he reached out to Caltrans and Cal-OES who said they knew nothing about them, so he then reached out to CalRecycle who noted they were hoping to have the road repaired when completed. He was provided a damage form to fill out and send in. Commissioner Oneto stated the truck traffic continued and after multiple attempts to discuss the issue with CalRecycle and getting no response, he is asking ACTC to send a letter to CalRecycle, Caltrans, and Cal-OES regarding next steps.

Mr. Gedney asked for legal counsel input. Ms. Ebrahimi stated she would need more information including review of the contract to see who has what rights regarding this issue. Commissioners directed staff to have Ms. Ebrahimi work with Mr. Gedney to write a letter to CalRecycle on behalf of the Chairman of the board regarding this concern.

**#11. Claims:** Mr. Gedney noted there is a revised claims list for approval. Ms. Bridges noted a change to the revised claims list includes the replacement of Commissioner Forster's payment to Commissioner Crew (Commissioner Forster's alternate).

**Motion:** It was moved by Commissioner Crew, seconded by Chairman Atlan, and carried to approve the revised claims.

Ayes: Atlan, McLean, Crew, Oneto  
Noes: None  
Absent: Bragstad, Plasse

**#12. ACTC Commissioner Reports:** None

**#13. ACTC Reports:** None

**#14. Caltrans Report with Gregoria Ponce:**

- The Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) fall regional workshop will take place on October 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, and 13<sup>th</sup>. This workshop will focus on an overview of safety trends as practices for saving lives, safe system approach, integrating equity, funding opportunities, and updates regarding the 2020-2024 SHSP.
- The Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) Program is a funding opportunity available through the U.S. DOT that funds projects that improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of intercity passenger and freight rail. Applications are due no later than 5:00 p.m. ET, December 1, 2022.
- The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) announced a Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) to solicit proposals from organizations interested in advancing research into transit bus automation through demonstrations of Advanced Driver Assistance Systems (ADAS) and automation of bus movements in transit bus yards. Project proposals are due November 21, 2022.
- Caltrans has processed the fiscal year 2021-22 reconciliation and close out for Amador, and look forward to the partnership on the FY 2022-23 Overall Work Program.

Vice Chairman McLean stated merchants posted advertisements for an event a few weeks ago and not knowing the rules, mistakenly placed some banners on highway bridges. He asked for a local contact regarding the retrieval of those banners that were removed. Ms. Ponce stated she will check with the maintenance department and send a note to see what the disposition would be for those.

Commissioner Oneto asked if the fire damage clean-up work being performed at Kirkwood Spur was a no-bid emergency contract. Ms. Ponce replied it was not - it was a contract that was ongoing to clear debris along that corridor, and the section observed was one of the last remaining sections to be performed and should be completed in the next week or so. Commissioner Oneto commented the work performed seemed to extend over a long period of time.

Chairman Atlan asked to be informed, when available, of the start date regarding work to be performed on Main St. in Ione. Ms. Ponce responded at this time November 18<sup>th</sup> looks to be the date, but she will confirm that with Charlie Madrell, the new Deputy for Maintenance.


**#15. Future Agenda Items:** Mr. Gedney stated it was discussed during the Amador Transit meeting to review other transit agencies for different operational models and efficiency efforts, specifically Tuolumne and Calaveras. He asked if that was something to include on a future ACTC agenda. Chairman Atlan suggested after the November meeting and review of the draft Triennial Performance Audit has been presented to conduct a “task force” of commissioners, AT staff, and ACTC staff to review options to operate Amador Transit at a lower cost. Commissioner Crew noted it may be beneficial to review rural transit agencies around California, not just other local agencies. Ms. Ebrahimi stated one of her clients faced the same issue, they severely cut down the bus system and for the same price they started offering direct, on-demand service which the residents love. She stated her firm represented the agency and it was the first case in California to implement that service and it has become a huge success. Mr. Gedney stated staff would do further research and bring information back at a future meeting.

- CalRecycle- Shenandoah Road truck traffic
- ACUSD School Consolidation Plan-Traffic Impacts

**#16. Adjournment:** At 12:13 p.m. the Chairman adjourned the regular meeting until 9:00 a.m. Thursday, November 3, 2022, at 117 Valley View Way Sutter Creek, CA 95685.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dominic Atlan, Chairman  
Amador County Transportation Commission

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

(Note: Copies of referenced documents are available at the ACTC office.)